

REMARKS

Claims 2-16 and 29-43 are currently pending in the application with claims 5, 9, 10, 12, 32, 36, 37 and 39 in independent form. Claims 17-28 have been previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the instant application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 11, and 14-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hensley, in view of Abel, et al. (US Patent No. 5,289,371), the anonymous article, "Electrical," and official notice. Claims 3, 6, 8, and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hensley, in view of Abel, et al. (US Patent No. 5,289,371), the anonymous article, "Electrical," and official notice, in further view of Donner, et al. (EP Application 0 512 702 A2). Claims 9, 10, and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hensley, in view of Abel, et al. (US Patent No. 5,289,371), and official notice. The Examiner asserts that claim 32 is parallel to claim 5, and dependent claims 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 38, 40, 41, 42, and 43 are parallel to claims 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, and 16 respectively. The Examiner also asserts that claims 36 and 37 parallel claims 9 and 10 respectively, and are rejected on the same grounds. (See, Office Action, page 16). The Examiner additionally asserts that claim 39 is almost parallel to claim 12, and therefore rejected on much the same grounds, and further in view of the anonymous article, "Electrical." Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections and submit that the pending claims are patentably distinct from the cited references for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 5 recites *inter alia*:

An allocation method in a buyer-driven system in which conditional purchase offers are received and considered by or on behalf of a plurality of sellers, the conditional purchase offers each including (1) a buyer-specified price for a good or service (2) a payment identifier specifying a financial account to be used to pay for said good or service upon acceptance of a conditional purchase offer by a seller and (3) authorization to charge said payment identifier for said good or service upon acceptance of a conditional purchase offer, comprising:

determining which of at least two sellers could satisfy a conditional purchase offer;
identifying one of the at least two sellers as a priority seller based on a priority metric; and
after receiving said buyer-specified price, payment identifier and authorization, providing the priority seller with a first look opportunity to satisfy a conditional purchase offer.

Applicants respectfully submit that cited references taken alone or in combination do not teach, disclose or suggest a conditional purchase offer that includes a buyer-specified price or identifying a priority seller based on a priority metric, as recited in independent claim 5.

The Examiner asserts that "Hensley discloses...conditional purchase offers including a buyer-specified price for a good or service (first page, fourteenth text paragraph et subsequ.)" (See, Office Action, page 6, ¶ 2). Applicants submit that Hensley does not teach, disclose or suggest a conditional purchase offer including (1) a buyer-specified price for a good or service (2) a payment identifier specifying a financial account to be used to pay for said good or service upon acceptance of a conditional purchase offer by a seller and (3) authorization to charge said payment identifier for said good or service upon acceptance of a conditional purchase offer buyer-specified price for a good or service. There is clearly no such teaching of each of these claimed elements in the Hensley reference. Hensley's article merely discusses a negotiating processing in which a potential buyer was "bargaining with the vendors." (See, Hensley, page 1, text: ¶ 3). As described, Hensley's buyer engages a seller in negotiations "during the course of the next 15 to 25 minutes the price changed constantly...." (See, Hensley, page 1, text: ¶ 12). Therefore, Applicants

submit Hensley's negotiating method is not analogous to and does not disclose, teach or suggest the claimed buyer-driven system based on a buyer's conditional purchase offer that includes a (1) a buyer-specified price for a good or service (2) a payment identifier specifying a financial account to be used to pay for said good or service upon acceptance of a conditional purchase offer by a seller and (3) authorization to charge said payment identifier for said good or service upon acceptance of a conditional purchase offer.

Furthermore, the cited references taken alone or in combination do not teach, suggest or disclose identifying a priority seller based on a priority metric, as recited in the claims. The Examiner alleges:

"Hensley does not expressly disclose identifying one of at least two sellers as a priority seller, but by beginning with a particular seller, while knowing that there was another shop down the street (second page, fourth, fifth, and ninth paragraphs), Hensley implicitly identified that seller as a priority seller. (See, Office Action, page 6, ¶ 2).

Applicants submit that Hensley does not suggest any reason for selecting a first shop instead of a second shop. As such, a buyer arbitrarily entering a first shop is simply not analogous to identifying a first shop as a priority seller based on a priority metric. For a similar reason, Abel's sending floral orders to a plurality of florists based on their ability to satisfy an order to deliver flowers does not constitute identifying a priority seller based on a priority metric. As such, Applicants submit that the cited references taken alone or in combination do not teach, disclose or suggest identifying a priority seller based on a priority metric, as recited in independent claim 5.

Moreover, Applicants submit that Donner, et al. does not remedy the deficiencies discussed above with regard to independent claim 5 and the Hensley and Abel references.

Additionally, Applicants submit that the anonymous article "Electrical" does not remedy the deficiencies discussed above with regard to independent claim 5 and the Hensley, Abel,

and Donner references. Applicants submit that the "Electrical" reference does not disclose identifying a priority seller based on a priority metric. A user's decisions regarding where to shop in the seller driven system disclosed in the "Electrical" article is simply not analogous to identifying a first shop as a priority seller based on a priority metric. This is especially true, as the Examiner admits, in a buyer-driven system where factors discussed in the article that affect purchasing decisions in a seller-driven system (such as which seller offers the best price) are irrelevant.

In addition to the significant deficiencies identified above regarding Hensley and Abel, Applicants traverse the instances of Official Notice in the Office Action and submit that the pending claims are not rendered obvious based on the cited references and the alleged Official Notice for at least these reasons. In the event that the Examiner maintains the current rejections, Applicants request that the Examiner support the Official Notice assertions with a viable reference. Also, Applicants reserve the right to address the Examiner's assertions Official Notice individually, if the rejections are maintained.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicants submit the claimed invention recited in independent claims 5, 9, 10, 12, 32, 36, 37 and 39 are patentably distinct from the cited references for at least these reasons, among others. Furthermore, in view of the fact that each of the independent claims of the instant application are distinguishable from the cited references for the aforementioned reason, Applicants submit that the dependent claims of the instant application are also distinguishable for at least similar reasons. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of these grounds of rejections.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 03-1240, Order No. 17200-018. In the event that an additional extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 03-1240, Order No. 17200-018.

Respectfully Submitted,
CHADBOURNE & PARKE, L.L.P.

Date: July 31, 2006

BY: /Walter G. Hanchuk/
Walter G. Hanchuk, Reg. No. 35,179

Address:
Chadbourne & Parke, L.L.P.
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10112
212-408-5100 Telephone
212-541-5369 Facsimile